

SUBJECT: Water utility fees charged to certain recreational vehicle parks

COMMITTEE: Urban Affairs — committee substitute recommended

VOTE: 6 ayes — Dutton, Alvarado, Elkins, Leach, J. Rodriguez, Sanford
0 nays
1 absent — Anchia

WITNESSES: For — Brian Schaeffer, Texas Association of Campground Owners;
(*Registered, but did not testify:* Carol Baker, Texas Recreational Vehicle Association; Mark Borskey, Texas Recreational Vehicle Association)

Against — None

DIGEST: CSHB 2152 would require that municipally owned water utilities charge recreational vehicle parks the same as other commercial businesses that serve transient customers and receive nonsubmetered master-meter service.

The bill would prohibit water districts from charging RV parks on the basis of connections to the park's transient customers. The fee would have to be based on the recreational vehicle park's nonsubmetered connection.

This bill would take effect September 1, 2013.

SUPPORTERS SAY: CSHB 2152 would clarify existing law that prohibits municipally owned water utilities and water districts from charging master metered RV parks fees for water service based on the number of individual connections.

Despite clear language that prohibits cities and water districts from charging fees for each individual connection at an RV park that is being master metered, some cities continue to try to get around current law. This bill would send a clear statement to cities and water districts to charge master-metered RV parks the same as they charge other businesses, such as motels and hotels. Cities and water districts do not charge lodging properties water fees based on the number of visitors

staying at their establishments and RV parks should be treated in the same manner.

**OPPONENTS
SAY:**

Water within an RV park is delivered to individual taps or dwellings. Municipally owned water utilities and water districts should be able to bill the RV park a fee for each individual tap.

Local governments know best how to run their own water systems to address local needs. The bill is yet another state mandate interfering with local control.